

Interview Agenda

For: Application Nos. 10/715,511 and 10/715,462
HDP 46500-000580/US and 46500-000581/US
Time and Date: October 29, 2009 at 2pm
Participants: Helen Shibru, Thai Tran, and Jared Scholz (Reg. No. 64,088)
Examiner's Phone No. 571-272-7329
Examiner's Fax No. 571-273-7329

I. Application No. 10/715,511 (HDP 580/US)

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Applicants wish to discuss the rejection to claims 1, 3, 5, 8-12, 18, 26-27, 34-39, 51, 53, 55, 57 and 59 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0145702) in view of De Haan (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2009/0180757) and further in view of Hamada (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2008/0253742). In particular, Applicants would like to discuss claim 1, which is reproduced below.

1. A computer readable medium having a data structure for managing reproduction of video data, comprising:
 - a data area storing a stream file including the video data;
 - a clip information area storing a clip information file corresponding to the stream file, the clip information file including timing information of the video data;
 - a playlist area storing a playlist file including at least one playitem, the playitem identifying a playing interval in a clip of the video data; and
 - a navigation area storing a navigation file including a path item, the path item including a first navigation command for launching the playlist file to reproduce and a second navigation command for proceeding to a next path item, wherein the stream file, the clip information file, the playlist file, and the navigation file are separate and have different file extensions from each other.

The Examiner acknowledges that Kato does not disclose "a navigation area storing a navigation file including a path item, the path item including a first navigation command for launching the playlist file to reproduce and a second navigation command for proceeding to a next path item" of claim 1. Rather, the Examiner relies upon De Haan as disclosing these features. The Examiner cites paragraphs [0045], [0064], [0083], [0103-0104], table 2, and paragraphs [0079] of De Haan.

Applicants disagree. For example, the Examiner alleges that De Haan discloses the first navigation command for launching the **playlist file**. A playlist file is defined in claim 1 as "a playlist file including at least one playitem, the playitem

identifying a *playing interval* in a clip of the video data. The Examiner asserts that the Playlist Title of De Haan corresponds to the "playlist file" of claim 1. The Playlist Title of De Haan is defined as "[t]itle representing a *play back sequence* of cells from one recording. Play Lists are accessible via the Title Menu." See Paragraph [0045] of De Haan.

The technical meaning of the Play list Title of De Haan is completely different from that of the playlist file of claim 1 (or Kato). Thus, De Haan does not disclose launching a playlist file.

Even assuming that the Playlist Title of De Haan corresponds to the "playlist file" of claim 1, De Haan still does not disclose or suggest "a first navigation command for launching the playlist file." The Pre-Command (allegedly the first navigation command) of De Haan "call[s] the Title Menu." See paragraph [0064]. The Playlist title is accessible via the title menu. See paragraph [0045]. In other words, the pre-command of De Haan does not launch the Playlist Title, but only a Title Menu.

In addition, Applicants would like to discuss the combination of Kato and De Haan. For instance, because the playlist title of De Haan and the playlist file of Kato have completely different meanings, we believe the combination is not proper.

Also, Applicants would like to discuss the Examiner's reliance upon Hamada. For example, the Examiner relies upon Hamada as disclosing "wherein the stream file, the clip information file, the playlist file, and the navigation file are separate and have different file extensions from each other." The Examiner asserts that the file "info.dvr" is allegedly the "navigation file." However, "info.dvr" does not mention anything about a navigation file including a path item, the path item including a first navigation command. In other words, the "info.dvr" does not include a navigation file within the meaning of claim 1. Therefore, Hamada could not possibly disclose a playlist file having a different file extension from the navigation file.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph

The Examiner asserts that "computer readable medium" is not supported in the specification. Applicants would like to discuss FIG. 7 of the present application.

II. Application No. 10/715,462 (HDP 581/US)

This application contains similar issues to the issues described above.